

CCH Rate Structure Committee Meeting
August 8, 2012

In Attendance: Mary-beth Santarsiero, Tim Lavoy, Peter Mason, Jeannine Pettinico, Mary Beth O'Neill, Peter Mason, Catherina Ohm, Sheryl Kemp and Kathy Calo.

Absent: Carol Grabbe

Massachusetts Services

Catherina Ohm and Kathy Calo went to Sandwich Massachusetts to meet with a state employee who works with Shared Living Services.

How is Shared Living different than the Community Companion Home Program?

- Agency hires and train their own staff to provide support in the home
- Private agency manages the individual's finances
- Policies are different
- Non-licensed homes
- Strict oversight and accountability
- Built in respite – 6 weekends and 2 weeks per year
- Staffing in the home 20 hours per week
- Housing ownership/rental options available
- Roommate moves into the home to provide supervision and obtains a tax free stipend
- Massachusetts pays the agency and the agency pays the provider
- Individuals with higher LON levels receive support
- Many providers work for the agency in another area
- Utilities may or may not be paid by the agency depending on the initial contract
- More behavioral support as a result of higher LON scores

The group discussed the potential tax implications if the state was not making the provider payment directly and some of the barriers to creating such a system in Connecticut. Potential modifications to the current rate and increased clinical supports would be a start to creating something enhanced here. The Shared Living program is a waived program in Massachusetts.

What would be the benefit of this model over the CCH model? This could be an option for people with increased needs (LON 7 or 8) who need significant support. Individuals would receive more clinical services and some additional oversight for a provider. This could be built into the CCH program as another option in Connecticut. The benefit would be to prevent provider burnout and reduce risk of abuse. The people that step in to provide support would be trained by the agency and closely supervised.

The group discussed potential issues around the Fair Labor Standards Act. Catharina will provide the rules regarding people who work for a company as an employee and then perform similar duties as a subcontractor.

In Connecticut, 17.3 hours per month of respite exist in the current rate for Rate 2 and 3. Rate 1 does not include the respite rate. A program must either be licensed or certified in order to receive a tax free stipend. Tax Code number 131 will be explored by the group. A service titled Live-In Companion is an approved waiver service. A person lives with a roommate and the roommate is available during the night. Minimal support may or may not be provided. Rent subsidy covers the cost of the rent. The roommate receives free rent, not a paycheck.

Peter discussed potential modifications to the current CCH model in order to meet the needs of those with higher LON levels. Peter suggested giving private agencies additional funds to provide for additional direct support hours, clinical services, and respite. A few concerns were discussed regarding potential liability of licensee who owns the home, including workers comp for staff working within the provider's home.

The Executive Director of CSI and the COO will schedule a meeting with Terry Macey to discuss alternative 24 hour Non-CLA support options. This could be a cost effective model for Connecticut that has not yet been considered.

The group discussed potential increased costs to the state; however, acknowledged that there would be significant cost saving if higher cost placements could be avoided in the future. The group discussed adding 72 clinical hours per year, which would include nursing and behavioral, approximately \$9000 in support funds and staff support. The group will break down the current rate and discuss potential costs for increased services at the next meeting.

Roles and responsibilities were discussed. Some providers complete PRC paperwork and others have the behaviorist complete the forms. What does the 15 hours of admin included in the A&G line item pay for? Does that mean the agency will complete a PRC packet or a provider?

Tim researched the history of definitions since the inception of the program. Definitions requiring review are 24 hour, less than 24 hour, and ongoing comprehensive. Peter stressed the importance of running any definition by Systems Design. Systems Design reviews the continuity of definitions across the system. This assures others people in the system are not impacted by a change in definition. Tim will forward a link with list of definitions to the committee.

Payments should equate to LONs and anything more should go to URR. This would impart equity into the system. Currently, rates 1 and 2 levels are inflated to make a higher payment to the provider to allow for exceptional circumstances. We may need to identify a transition plan to capture any future rate changes. A person who is a LON 1 may need to move out of a group home placement in the future into a less restrictive setting.

Next meeting:

1. Definitions relating to 24 hour supports and supervision levels
2. Catherine will obtain DOL information
3. Examine components of CTV rates
4. Defining expectations for level 7 homes